The Town of Summerville Planning Commission Meeting Minutes July 17, 2023

This meeting of the Town of Summerville Planning Commission was held in the 2nd floor Training Room and was attended by Commission Members, Jim Reaves, Chairman; Charlie Stoudenmire; Betty Profit; and Tom Hart. Kevin Carroll; Elain Segelken and Jim Bailey were unable to attend. Staff in attendance included Tim Macholl, Zoning Administrator, and Rhonda Moore, Director of Finance. The public was invited to attend in person, or they viewed the meeting via live-stream.

Jim Reaves, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

Approval of Minutes:

The Chairman asked if there were any edits or additions to the minutes from the meeting on June 19, 2023. Hearing none the minutes were approved as submitted.

Public Hearings:

The first public hearing opened at 4:01 PM and was for the petition by Rolina Investments LLC to annex TMS#s 145-03-01-005, -006, and -009, located at 207 and 209 Garbon Drive, and totaling approximately 3.2 acres. Currently zoned R-1(M)(A), R-1, and TRM, respectively, in Dorchester County and will be zoned GR-5, General Residential, upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council District 3) Mr. Reaves introduced the item. Mr. Elliott Locklair of Locklair Consulting was present and explained that the annexation is based on the need for sewer service for the future residential development. Hearing no other public comment, the public hearing was closed at 4:03 PM.

The second public hearing opened at 4:03 PM and was for the request to rezone TMS# 130-10-00-033 located at 823 W. 5th North Street, totaling approximately 1.69 acres, and owned by Dorchester County, from UC-MX. Urban Corridor Mixed-Use, to PL, Public Lands. (Council District 1). Mr. Reaves introduced the item. Ms. Nancy McKewen of Tupco Inc. was present and explained that the rezoning is for Dorchester County. They own the property and intend to develop it for a new Coroner's Office. The design is intended to blend into the adjacent County-owned property design. Mr. Locklair stated that the county would probably abandon the property line between the two properties. Hearing no other public comment, the public hearing was closed at 4:06 PM.

The third public hearing opened at 4:06 PM and was for the request to rezone TMS# 130-10-00-051, located at 603 N. Maple Street, totaling approximately 0.77 acres, and owned by Lawrence and Melissa Lopez Gibson, from N-R. Neighborhood Residential, to N-B. Neighborhood Business. (Council District 1). Mr. Reaves introduced the item. The applicant was not in attendance. Hearing no other public comment, the public hearing was closed at 4:07 PM.

The fourth public hearing opened at 4:07 PM and was for the request to amend the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 10 - Signs, Section 10.5 - Changeable Copy Signs. Mr. Reaves introduced the item. The applicant was not in attendance. Hearing no public comment, the public hearing was closed at 4:07 PM.

The fifth public hearing opened at 4:07 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 7 – Parking and Driveways, Section 7.3 – Vehicle Parking Location. Mr. Reaves introduced the item. Hearing no public comment, the public hearing was closed at 4:08 PM.

The sixth public hearing opened at 4:08 PM and was for the <u>proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 10 – Signs, Section 10.2.1 – Applicability, Section 10.4.3 – Building Signs Requiring a Permit, Section 10.5 – Changeable Copy Signs, Section 10.8.1 – Incidental Signs, and Section 10.9 – Prohibited Signs, Mr. Reaves introduced the item. Hearing no public comment, the public hearing was closed at 4:08 PM.</u>

The seventh public hearing opened at 4:08 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 13 – Administration & Procedures. Section 13.3.3 – Board of Zoning Appeals and Section 13.4.2 – Public Notice Requirements. Mr. Reaves introduced the item. Hearing no public comment, the public hearing was closed at 4:09 PM.

The eighth public hearing opened at 4:09 PM and was for the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 15 – Definitions, Section 15.3 – Definition of Terms, Mr. Reaves introduced the item. Hearing no public comment, the public hearing was closed at 4:09 PM.

Old Business

There were no items under Old Business.

New Business:

The first item under New Business was New Street Names. Mr. Macholl stated that they one street name, Trucking Lane, that had passed the County Verification process. Mr. Macholl admitted that he was not familiar with the exact location, but that it was acceptable to the Town as well. Mr. Hart made a motion to approve Trucking Lane. Ms. Profit seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The second item under New Business was the petition by Rolina Investments LLC to annex TMS#s 145-03-01-005, -006, and -009, located at 207 and 209 Garbon Drive, and totaling approximately 3.2 acres. Currently zoned R-1(M)(A), R-1, and TRM, respectively, in Dorchester County and will be zoned GR-5. General Residential, upon annexation into the Town of Summerville's municipal limits. (Council District 3). Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval of the annexation to Council, and Ms. Profit made the second. Hearing no discussion, Mr. Reaves called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

The third item under New Business was a request to rezone TMS# 130-10-00-033, located at 823 W, 5th North Street, totaling approximately 1.69 acres, and owned by Dorchester County, from UC-MX, Urban Corridor Mixed-Use, to PL, Public Lands. (Council District 1), Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning request to Council, and Mr. Stoudenmire made the second. Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Reaves called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

The fourth item under New Business was a request to rezone TMS# 130-10-00-051, located at 603 N. Maple Street, totaling approximately 0.77 acres, and owned by Lawrence and Melissa Lopez Gibson, from N-R. Neighborhood Residential, to N-B. Neighborhood Business, (Council District 1). Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning request to Council, and Ms. Profit made the second. Mr. Macholl explained the location and history of the request. He explained that this location was probably no longer a viable residential parcel. Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Reaves called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

The fifth item under New Business was a request to amend the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 10 - Signs, Section 10.5 - Changeable Copy Signs. Mr. Macholl provided the background regarding the request for the changes to the sign ordinance. It was detailed that the applicant had put up a sign without a permit, or BAR approval. Staff identified this sign and had the sign removed. In response the applicant proposed these changes, including making digital window signs able to be approved by staff. Mr. Macholl presented the proposed changes. He explained that Digital Signs are

permitted for schools and other public entities. He explained that digital signs are not supported by the Design Review Board, and that staff is not in support of taking the review responsibility out of the hands of the Boards. Staff identified that there are ambiguities and identified some good aspects of the suggested modifications and incorporated them into Staff's proposed changes. Mr. Hart asked why changeable signs are more regulated than other signs. Mr. Macholl explained that digital signs are difficult to enforce the standards as established. Previously approved digital signs have proven to be difficult to enforce. He explained that the Town has chosen to limit the type of sign not the content. Discussion centered around the content and advantage of digital signage. The Town has decided that the distraction and aesthetic issue is the basis for Design Review Board or BAR review. Discussion continued regarding the details of the proposed modifications. Mr. Hart continued to make the argument that businesses should be able to have the right, if they choose to purchase the technology to be able to obtain a sign. Mr. Macholl made the point that it should be up to the respective design review board to decide whether that type signage is appropriate in that location. The argument was made that the design review approvals could be too arbitrary, and that they were not based in any specific standards. The Commission thought that if an applicant met certain standards, they should be able to get a sign.

The Planning Commission chose to move the request forward without a recommendation.

The sixth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 7 – Parking and Driveways, Section 7.3 – Vehicle Parking Location. Mr. Macholl explained that the proposed changes are a cleanup of unintended minor issues identified in the exhibits and text of this section. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to Council, and Ms. Profit made the second. Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Reaves called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

The seventh item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 10 – Signs, Section 10.2.1 – Applicability, Section 10.4.3 – Building Signs Requiring a Permit, Section 10.5 – Changeable Copy Signs, Section 10.8.1 – Incidental Signs, and Section 10.9 – Prohibited Signs, Mr. Macholl explained the clarifications proposed by staff. He pointed out the specific clarifications, better definitions, and separation of wall and window signage. Mr. Hart expressed a concern about the nature of making approval subject to a design review board. He made the point that the standards needed to be cleaner, and the subjective nature of the review should be removed. He thought that if an applicant met the standards to have a digital sign, they should be able to obtain an approval for a digital sign. Mr. Macholl explained that because of the uneven boundary of the Town limits, there can be businesses that are located in the Town right next to businesses that are not in the Town. This creates an issue for enforcement and situations where a business in the county may have a digital sign and the business in Town could be denied. The Commission members felt that additional clarifications would be beneficial to these amendments. Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend denial of the proposed amendments to Council, and Ms. Profit made the second. Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Reaves called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

The eighth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 13 – Administration & Procedures, Section 13.3.3 – Board of Zoning Appeals and Section 13.4.2 – Public Notice Requirements, Mr. Hart made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to Council, and Ms. Profit made the second. Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Reaves called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

The ninth item under New Business was the proposed amendments to the Summerville Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Chapter 15 – Definitions, Section 15.3 – Definition of Terms, Ms. Profit made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to Council, and Mr. Hart made the

second. Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Reaves called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

Miscellaneous:

There were no items under Miscellaneous.

<u>Adjourn</u>

With no further business for the Commission, Mr. Hart made a motion to adjourn with Ms. Profit making the second. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 5:08 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Macholl
Zoning Administrator

Date: 8/21/2023

Jim Reaves, Chairman or Jim Bailey, Vice Chairman